AO 472 (Rev. 09/08) Detention Order Pending Trial - MIWD (Rev. 10/09)

United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

	V. Jorge Solorio-Lopez	Case No. 1:16-mj-00312-ESC
	Delendant	
	After conducting a detention hearing under the Ballefendant be detained pending trial.	ail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require
	Part	I – Findings of Fact
(1)		ribed in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has previously been convicted of ense that would have been a federal offense if federal jurisdiction had
		C. § 3156(a)(4), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for
	an offense for which the maximum sente	
	an offense for which a maximum prison to	·
		*
	U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable	
	any felony that is not a crime of violence a minor victim	but involves:
		earm or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon U.S.C. § 2250
(2)	The offense described in finding (1) was comm or local offense.	tted while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state
(3)	A period of less than 5 years has elapsed since offense described in finding (1).	the date of conviction defendant's release from prison for the
(4)	Findings (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable person or the community. I further find that def	presumption that no condition will reasonably assure the safety of another endant has not rebutted that presumption.
	Alte	rnative Findings (A)
(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defe	endant has committed an offense
	for which a maximum prison term of ten y Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 80	
	under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).	···
(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption will reasonably assure the defendant's appeara	n established by finding (1) that no condition or combination of conditions nce and the safety of the community.
		rnative Findings (B)
	There is a serious risk that the defendant will no	
(2)		ndanger the safety of another person or the community.
		nt of the Reasons for Detention
evidence	a preponderance of the evidence that:	d at the detention hearing establishes by <u>✓</u> clear and convincing
	ndant waived his detention hearing, electing not	
	ndant is subject to an ICE detainer and would no ndant may bring the issue of his continuing deter	ntion to the court's attention should his circumstances change.

Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or a designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.

Date:	December 7, 2016	Judge's Signature:	/s/ Ellen S. Carmody	
		Name and Title:	Ellen S. Carmody, U.S. Magistrate Judge	